The neg must have an explicit advocacy text defending the converse of the resolution proving a positive obligation exists to value retribution solely, else you affirm. This ensures reciprocity since the AC is bound to a unilateral advocacy which has the strongest internal to fairness to maintain competitive equity and stability is key to make them engage my arguments. Other interps make AC ground nonunique and unclear which is key as the basis for determining relevant arguments. Next, if the aff wins any offense to a counter interp or an I meet, vote aff—A) theory takes more time to respond to than to read skewing my 1AR strat—force the neg to defend their interp, B) Competing mutually exclusive interps force the aff into a double bind of being subject to theory no matter what is run in the AC so no neg RVIs. I’m forced to defend something in the 1AC so don’t drop me for violating. Next, presume aff since the 57% neg bias (FantasyDebate) means affirming overcomes the greatest disadvantages.

I value morality. The A point is subjectivism.

Ethics devolve to the individual perspective since people constantly gain new knowledge, making their perspective the most indicative of truth.

**Anker**, (Michael Anker, [PhD Dissertation] “The Ethics of Uncertainty: Aporetic Openings”, Atropos Press, 2009. Pg 25)

As mentioned and affirmed, all things (concepts, words, objects, subjects, etc.) are in a state of becoming. Gaining knowledge or insight into any of these particulars thus entails an unstable terrain. **If some-thing is constantly in a state of** also **becoming some-thing other, there is no stable ground for absolute knowledge** and judgment. Furthermore, and to complicate matters even more so, **it is not only the object** being considered **that exists in a state of transformation, but** also **the “subject” doing the interpretation. What we have** left **is a** thoroughly **perspectival** (Nietzsche) **relation to viewing and interpreting what we see and know of this world.** By affirming this, **knowledge becomes not** a ground or **an end in itself, but the means for a continual perspectival shifting**. Perspectivism, as a thoroughly ungrounded and continuously shifting mode of interpretation, furthermore affirms the uncertainty of an indeterminate subject, object, and conceptual becoming.

And, moral disagreement plagues objectivist systems because there’s no way to resolve differences.

**McGrath**, (Sarah McGrath, Moral Disagreement and Moral Expertise, http://www.princeton.edu/~smcgrath/moraldisagreement.pdf)

In some ways, **moral disagreement seems to parallel the diversity of opinion as [color]** to which shade of green is *unique green*. Unique green is that shade of green that is neither bluish nor yellowish. **When asked to select** the **[a particular shade]** shade which is unique green, **different subjects** with normal color vision **will select different shades**.⁸ As in the case of our controversial moral views, opinion about which shade is unique green not only fails to be unanimous, but is substantially divided. Perhaps if there were relatively widespread agreement as to which shade is unique green, then the dissenting judgments of a few who possessed otherwise normal color vision could be dismissed. But the fact that the actual **division of opinion** is substantial **suggests that human beings are not reliable detectors of the relevant property.** That relevantly similar creatures—**[since] creatures with the same type of visual system—arrive at different verdicts when similarly situated** seems to show that that kind of creature is simply not well equipped to detect the presence or absence of the property in question. That human beings are not, as a species, reliable detectors of unique green seems to tell against crediting any individual with knowledge that a certain shade is unique green, particularly if the individual knows of this general lack of reliability and has no good reason to think that he is exceptional in this respect. Note that although questions about which shade of green is unique green are hard questions for human beings, such questions do not present themselves to us as difficult ones. In fact, most subjects are quite confident of their initial judgments; **each person’s view strikes her as obviously correct. This seems parallel to the moral case:** in the moral case too, **many find that their own views about controversial moral questions strike them as obviously correct.**

Any attempt to derive truth collapses into the first person, since it’s up to the individual to see if they’re consistent with the ethic.

**MacIntyre**, (MacIntyre, Alasdair [Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame] “After Virtue” Notre Dame Press, 1981, 20-21)

**An agent can only justify a** particular **judgment by referring to some universal rule from which it may be** logically **derived,** and can only justify that rule in turn by deriving it from some more general rule or principle; **but** on this view **since every chain of reasoning must be finite, such a process** of justificatory reasoning **must always terminate with the assertion of some rule** or principle **for which no further reason can be given**. Each individual implicitly or explicitly has to adopt his or her own first principles on the basis of such a choice. **The utterance of any universal principle is an expression of the preferences** of for that will its principles have and itthem by adopting them.”However, that does not mean morality in and of its self cannot exist, therefore, I present the following burden analysisan individual will **and can have only such authority as [one] chooses to confer upon [it]**.

The B point is normativity. To reconcile our subjective beliefs we must look towards community norms.

First, moral communities control the internal link into subjective beliefs because it determines what we find valuable.

**Reshef**, (Yonathan Reshef. Solidarity, Communitarian Ontology, and Individual Rights. http://gradcon.huji.ac.il/2009/reshef.pdf)

Now, it is still left for me to show that **we cannot make strong evaluations,** i.e., **to morally classify our desires, outside the framework of the community** (claim 3), because one could claim that even if there are strong evaluations that constitute my identity, from this alone it does not follow that I cannot make strong evaluations on my own. Why should we affirm that judging my desires is done according to some external standards? Alternatively, it can be suggested that it is not my values which constitute my choice, but it is my choice which constitutes my values. In other words, I do not travel in a given moral space, using a compass showing me the way. Instead, I move in a vacuum, and wherever I turn would be where the needle points. But **making a choice involves judging the alternatives** in front of me, **and** in order for this judgment to be meaningful **it must be made in view of a standard that is independent of the action of judgment itself**. In other words, if the standard changes according to the judgment so that the judgment will always be correct, the act of judging has no meaning.11 Previously, I mentioned the agent's moral orientation. **The orientation is composed of two elements: space and the agent's location in it.** Space is **the external criterion, that must be set independently of the agent in order for the question 'Where do I stand?' to have meaning.** This is one aspect in which **the community constitutes her moral orientation. The community supplies the agent with the moral space in which she is located**, the external criterion in light of which she makes her moral judgments.

Second, the US is a federal republic defined as “**a state in which power rests with the people or their representatives**” (CIA.gov), so the US definitionally ought to do what its people will. This means not only that democracy is the only way to say what the US ought to do, but also that any other ethical system would change the agent we are talking about, and is thus incoherent, so textually it precedes other justifications.

Third, respect for rational thought demands democracy as democracy is the only theory that respects all rational decisions. Other systems make overreaching claims about the nature of rationality, what rational persons would preference or do given certain circumstances, and how social goods should be prioritized. Only democracy affords each individual an equal say in the formation of policies and doctrines; every other system collapses into dogma.

Fourth, suffering at your own hand allows people to cope with their decisions and any implications concerning the way their actions result in good or bad ends, while suffering at your own hand is mitigated by understanding that you willingly chose the principle

Fifth, in a subjective world, democracy is epistemologically most likely to be true and key to identity construction.

**Christiano**, (Thomas Christiano. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Jul 27, 2006. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/democracy/#NonInsVal Democracy)

Two kinds of in instrumental benefits are commonly attributed to democracy: relatively good laws and policies and improvements in the characters of the participants. John Stuart Mill argued that **a democratic method** of making legislation is better than non-democratic methods in three ways: strategically, epistemically and via the improvement of the characters of democratic citizens (Mill, 1861, Chapter 3). Strategically, democracy has an advantage because it **forces decision-makers to take into account the interests**, rights and opinions **of most people in society.** Since democracy gives some political power to each more people are taken into account than under aristocracy or monarchy. The most forceful contemporary statement of this instrumental argument is provided by Amartya Sen, who argues, for example, that “no substantial famine has ever occurred in any independent country with a democratic form of government and a relatively free press” (Sen 1999, 152). The basis of this argument is that politicians in a multiparty democracy with free elections and a free press have incentives to respond to the expressions of needs of the poor. **Epistemologically,** democracy is thought to be the best decision-making method on the grounds that it is generally more reliable in helping participants discover the right decisions. Since democracy brings a lot of people into the process of decision making, **it can take advantage of many sources of information and critical assessment of** **laws and** policies. Democratic decision-making tends to be more informed than other forms about the interests of citizens and the causal mechanisms necessary to advance those interests. Furthermore, the broad based discussion typical of democracy enhances the critical assessment of the different **moral ideas that guide decision-makers**. Many have endorsed democracy on the basis of the proposition that **democracy has beneficial effects on character.** Many have noted with Mill and Rousseau that democracy tends to make **people stand up for themselves** morethan other forms of rule do **because it makes collective decisions depend on them more** than monarchy or aristocracy do. Hence, in democratic societies individuals are encouraged to be more autonomous. In addition, democracy tends to get people to think carefully and rationally more than other forms of rule because it makes a difference whether they do or not. Finally, some have argued that democracy tends to enhance the moral qualities of citizens. [In Addition] When they participate in making decisions, they have to listen to others, **they are called upon to justify themselves to others and they are forced to think in part in terms of the interests of others**. Some have argued that when people find themselves in this kind of circumstance, they come genuinely to think in terms of the common good and justice. Hence, some have argued that democratic processes tend to enhance the autonomy, rationality and morality of participants. Since these beneficial effects are thought to be worthwhile in themselves, they count in favor of democracy and against other forms of rule (Mill 1861, p. 74, Elster 2002, p. 152).Some argue in addition that the above effects on character tend to enhance the quality of legislation as well. A society of autonomous, rational, and moral decision-makers [Democracy] is more likely to produce good legislation than a society ruled by a self-centered person or small group of persons who rule over slavish and unreflective subjects.

Thus, the standard is consistency with communal norms, defined as looking towards what the majority of Americans desire on a certain issue.

I contend that people prefer valuing rehab over retribution.

First, two-thirds agree across a broad spectrum.

**Hart 02**, (Hart Research Associates, Changing Public Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System, 02)

Americans strongly favor rehabilitation and reentry programs over incapacitation as the best method of ensuring public safety. Nearly **two-thirds of** all **Americans** (66%) **agree** that **the best way to reduce crime is to rehabilitate prisoners** by requiring education and job training so they have the tools to turn away from a life of crime, while just one in three (28%) believe that keeping criminals off the streets through long prison sentences would be the more effective alternative.¶ **This idea has** broad-based **support**, **with** solid majorities of whites (63% / 31%), **fundamentalist Protestants** (55% / 36%), **and Republicans** (55% / 38%) supporting rehabilitation over incapacitation as the best way to reduce crime. Interestingly, the 23% **of Americans who report that they or a close family member have been the victim of a violent crime endorse rehabilitation even more strongly than the general public**, by a decisive **73% to 21%** margin.

Prefer this evidence: A) Reverse bias- Republicans and Protestants have a long history of supporting punitive measures so the shift shows broad support, B) Breadth- Every group interviewed supported rehab—all polls are subject to bias, so interviewing a large group of people and delineating results for ones that were expected to conclude otherwise provides the clearest result. C) Trend shifting- the margin is only getting bigger.

**Hart 2**, (ibid)

A question first developed by the Gallup organization confirms the same fundamental shift in attitudes. In 1994, **the public was [once] divided between fighting crime** by “attacking the social and economic problems that lead to crime **through better education** and job training” (51%) **or by “deterring crime** by improving law enforcement with more prisons, police, and judges” (42%). In December 2001, we found that **the same question now elicits a 66% to 29% majority in favor of attacking the causes** of crime.

Second, recent polls conclude aff.

**Wright on April 2nd**, (Criminal justice survey: Residents prefer prevention and rehabilitation over jail. Gary Wright. Charlotte Observer. http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2012/04/02/3143883/criminal-justice-survey-residents.html)

Most Mecklenburg County residents prefer prevention, enforcement and rehabilitation over incarceration as a way to deal with crime, according to the findings of a new survey on the local criminal justice system.¶ **Only 11 percent** of the 501 survey respondents **thought incarceration should be the top priority for dealing with crime.** The top priority for 35 percent was prevention, such as youth education programs. Twenty percent preferred rehabilitation, such as job training and treatment.¶ The majority of those surveyed – **68 percent** – **want** their county tax dollars spent on funding **rehab**ilitation **programs.** Twenty-five percent want taxpayer money spent on locking up offenders. **“Most respondents hold the belief that offenders can turn their lives around and become law abiding citizens under the right conditions and the majority believes the most important goal of sentencing should be rehabilitation, not punishment,”** the survey report states.¶ “Given these beliefs, it is not surprising that more respondents want to spend county funding on rehabilitation programs than on incarceration.”¶ The survey, which has a margin of error of 4.5 percent, was conducted by MarketWise Inc. of Charlotte in late January and early February. The company surveyed a random sample of Mecklenburg County residents by telephone.

Third, sympathy for youth offenders sways public opinion strongly towards rehab.

**NJJN 12**, (National Juvenile Justice Network, GBA Strategies." Web. 18 Dec. 2012.)

A **new national poll shows that the American public overwhelmingly** **believes** that youth **in** trouble with the law should receive treatment and **rehabilitation** instead of being locked up or automatically tried in adult court. **The survey of 1,000 American adults,** commissioned by the Campaign for Youth Justice (an NJJN partner) and conducted by GBA Strategies, **showed,** among other things, **that Americans strongly favor: rehabilitation and treatment approaches, such as** counseling, **education**, treatment, restitution, and community service, **for teens in trouble with the law (89%);** involving youths' families in treatment (86%), keeping youth close to home (77%), and ensuring youth are connected with their families (86%); having juvenile court judges decide whether young people should be tried in adult criminal court on a case-by-case basis rather than making the process automatic (76%); and providing independent oversight to ensure youth are protected from abuse while in state or local custody (84%).

Rehab ends indefinite detention. **Rabasa-2**[[1]](#footnote-1)

Radical Islamism has been an enduring problem for many nations, but it became a prominent international priority only after the 9/11 attacks. Counterterrorism campaigns in many theaters around the world have produced a mounting number of incarcerated Islamist extremists. hese detainees present a dual problem for the nations holding them. First, **most states do not want** to hold the growing numbers of **extremists in their prisons indefinitely**, and, in many cases, they lack the resources to do so. **They have** therefore **searched for a way to rehabilitate these prisoners so that they can be released without posing a threat to society.** Second, many states have recognized that prisons are often incubators of radicalization, and in an efort to stymie this process, they have sought to tackle radicalization in their penitentiaries by reforming extremist detainees. 8 To resolve the problems of indeinite detention and radicalization, a number of states created programs to reform captured extremists. **In the Middle East and Southeast Asia, these programs were** typically **premised on the notion that the extremists had been** misled into **following an incorrect interpretation of Islam;** therefore, **the prison-based programs sought to reeducate detainees.** he militants’ worldview was discussed and refuted through a religious dialogue, usually conducted by mainstream clerics. In addition to the theological discussions, some of these programs aimed to assist the ex-militants in reintegrating into society. 9

Indefinite detention increases terrorism. **Roth 08**, (Kenneth, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch, May/June 2008, “After Guantanamo: The Case Against Preventive Detention.” Foreign Affairs)

Preventive **detention** also **discourages citizens from cooperating with** counterterrorist **investigations, a crucial factor in uncovering terrorist plots.** Counterterrorism experts report that information gleaned from interrogating detainees is far less important than **info**rmation **delivered by members of the** general **public who see something suspicious and report it**. For example, information given by relatives of the perpetrators and the general public was key to the arrest of those responsible for the **[like] attempted bombings in London** on July 21, **2005**. Similarly, a British Muslim who found an acquaintance's behavior suspicious led the police. Because **sympathy for the victims of abusive** counterterrorism **policies [is high]** tends to be greatest in the communities that give rise to terrorists, policies such as preventive **detention jeopardize this vitally important source of intelligence to discover [bomb plots]** the plot to bomb several transatlantic flights using liquid explosives in August 2006.

Terrorism causes extinction. **Wilkinson and Hartwig 10**[[2]](#footnote-2)

Despite the differing viewpoints, the overall consensus appears to be that terrorism risk is an ongoing and in some cases growing threat. Here are some of the most recent projections and predictions on the terrorism threat: • Transit System Threat: Following the March 29, 2010 attacks by suicide bombers on the Moscow subway that killed 39 people, New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg announced that the New York City Police Department (NYPD) has stepped up its patrol of the subways. “We will learn from the terrible tragedy in Moscow, and we will continue to do everything possible to protect our transit system – and our entire city – from the threat of terrorism,” Bloomberg said. • Cyber Terrorism: FBI director Robert Mueller says the **threat of cyber terror**ism **is real and rapidly expanding** and warns that militant groups, foreign states and criminal organizations pose a growing threat to U.S. security as they target government and private computer networks.3 Speaking at an Internet security conference in March 2010, Mueller said militant groups like **al Qaeda had primarily used the Internet to recruit** members **and plan attacks**, but they have shown a clear interest in combining physical attacks with cyber attacks. Mueller’s comments follow a number of recent international Internet security incidents including an attack in January 2010 on computer networks at Google and around 30 other U.S. corporations that is believed to have originated in China. • Maritime Threat: On March 3, 2010, the Singapore navy warns that a terrorist group may be planning attacks on oil tankers in the Strait of Malacca, one of the world’s busiest shipping lanes. An advisory issued by the Singapore navy Information Fusion Centre (IFC) recommends that ships should “strengthen their on-board security measures and adopt community reporting to increase awareness and strengthen the safety of all seafarers.” • Country Risk: A global ranking of 196 countries by risk analyst Maplecroft published in February 2010 rates Iraq as the country most at risk for terrorist attacks for the second year running, followed by Afghanistan, Pakistan and Somalia. Other extreme risk nations are Lebanon, India, Algeria, Colombia and Thailand. • Economic Threat: The World Economic Forum Global Risk Report 2010 reports that international **terrorists** continue to **mount sizeable attacks, causing significant economic and human losses.** Drivers of increasing risk include: instability on the Indian sub-continent, particularly Indo-Pakistani relations but also indigenous movements such as Naxalites; the level of political radicalization from the economic crisis; weak governance in parts of Africa provides alternative retreat positions to Afghanistan and Pakistan. • Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD): James Jones, White House national security adviser, tells USA Today4 : “**Of all** the things **that could be the nightmare scenario, what’s the biggest** nightmare scenario**?** **Thirty years ago, one** of my predecessors **would have said nuclear war** with Russia**. Today,** as I’m in this chair, I can tell you **it’s** proliferation, the **acquisition of a w**eapon of **m**ass **d**estruction **by a terrorist organization.**” • Regional Terrorism Threat: Aon’s 2009 Terrorism Threat Map shows a more settled outlook for North America, Europe and Australia and attributes this to better counter-terrorism capability. However, it warns that the global recession could lead to a new generation of terrorists emerging from disaffected communities in a re-emergence of class-based politics.

Methodologies

Hart:

On behalf of the Open Society Institute, Peter D. **Hart Research Associates conducted** a multi-phase **research** project **from May through December, 2001. The first phase of the project consisted of a series of six focus groups held in diverse geographic locations** — Columbus, OH, Philadelphia, PA, and Atlanta, GA. Four sessions were held with white swing voters, one with political professionals, and one among criminal justice professionals. **Following the focus groups, Hart Research conducted a nationwide telephone survey of 1,056 adults** from September 6-17, 2001. The sample included a representative national cross section of 804 adults, plus oversamples of 101 African Americans and 151 Hispanics. **The minority oversamples were weighted to match their incidence in the U.S. population. The survey’s overall margin of error is +3.5%**, and is higher for specific subgroups. A large majority of the interviews (863) were conducted before the September 11 terrorist attacks, so the September survey should be understood as essentially a pre-9/11 measure of public opinion. From November 30 through December 2, 2001, Hart Research conducted a shorter follow-up survey among 1,014 adults to assess whether key attitudes toward criminal justice had shifted since September 11. The follow-up survey revealed that there had been little or no movement on questions measuring core criminal justice attitudes, indicating that the findings from the initial survey remain accurate and relevant.

Wright:

The survey, which has a margin of error of 4.5 percent, was conducted by MarketWise Inc. of Charlotte in late January and early February. The company surveyed a random sample of residents by telephone.

Permissibility 1AR

Extend the interpretation at the top of the aff that the neg must prove a positive obligation to value retribution over rehabilitation *<<win this theory debate>>* since reciprocity dictates that the neg be bound to the converse of the resolution as the strongest internal to fairness to maintain competitive equity. Fairness is a voter because the ballot creates contextual rules to follow, *[so if they violate this interp, this is an independent reason to affirm. If they don’t],* this means that any argument that prevents them from proving a positive obligation to negate is sufficient to affirm, so permissibility flows aff. Presumption also affirms since structural barriers make it harder on the aff.

So, overview to subpoint A in framework. If I win any of these arguments about why ethics devolves to the first person, it renders all actions morally permissible like the resolution since it’s up to the agent to decide for themselves whether or not we ought to value rehab. *They’ll say the resolution is one agent so it doesn’t matter, but the topic is descriptive, meaning it’s still up to each subject to decide its truth value.* There are two implications to any argument extended from this section.

First, it triggers permissibility because subjectivity renders each ethic different from person to person. It doesn’t matter if the neg wins their framework, it can be true in a subjective sense.

Second, this is terminal defense on their framework since it prevents it from being objectively true. If I win terminal defense on their framework and don’t win permissibility since I won’t be going for my ethic this triggers presumption since it means there’s zero risk of offense on either side.

So, extend Anker—people constantly gain new knowledge via their perspective on the world so their interpretation is the most consistent with their subjective sense at truth. Since people each have different experiences that shape the perspective, it’s impossible to make overarching claims about morality.

Next, extend McGrath—moral disagreement plagues all ethics, like the NC’s, since there’s no external criterion to resolve differences between each subject’s views. Just as we lack the capacity to objectively judge a color from one another, agents lack the normative capacity to objectively determine right from wrong, since each agent’s view will seem obviously correct to themselves.

Finally, extend MacIntyre—any attempt at truth, like the neg’s, ultimately devolves to first person since asking “why” to any moral judgment ultimately culminates in the assertion of the actor that the idea is true, which differs on the subject.

More Evidence

And people especially want rehab when it comes to treatment once they have already been convicted, Krisberg[[3]](#footnote-3) et al Attitudes of US Voters toward Prisoner Rehabilitation and Reentry Policies; Barry Krisberg Susan Marchionna, http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication\_pdf/focus-reentry-and-rehab.pdf

A large majority (**70%) prefer** Policy 4, **making state funded rehabilitation services available to incarcerated people both while they are in prison and after they have been released from** prison. Much fewer respondents prefer Policy 1 (**11%) [Prefer only punishment]**, Policy 2 (**11%) [Prefer rehab** **while in prison],** or Policy 3 **(6%) [Prefer rehab after prison**].

Rehab has been widely supported since before 9/11. OSI ‘2:

Changing Public Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FEBRUARY 2002 Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. for The Open Society Institute <http://www.prisonpolicy.org/scans/CJI-Poll.pdf>

American public opinion on crime has changed surprisingly little in the wake of September 11. This study included one survey conducted prior to and another after the terrorist attacks (see methodology description below). After the attacks, Americans’ beliefs about the best approach to reducing crime and ensuring public safety had not changed at all, prevention was still the most popular approach, and the public still placed greater emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation than they do on punishment and law enforcement. Furthermore, the public still overwhelmingly believes that the best way to reduce crime and improve public safety is a proactive approach that address the root causes of crime, rather than a deterrent approach that focuses on harsh penalties. The proportion who say we need a tougher approach to dealing with the causes of crime rather than a greater emphasis on stricter sentencing, capital punishment, and fewer paroles was virtually unmoved from before September 11. Likewise, the post-9/11 survey showed that most Americans still believe we should put more money and effort into attacking the social and economic problems that lead to crime through better education and job training rather than focusing on deterring crime by improving law enforcement with more prisons, police, and judges. And Americans continue to favor rehabilitation and reentry programs over incapacitation as the most effective way to ensure public safety.

[On behalf of the Open Society Institute, Peter D. Hart Research Associates conducted a multi-phase research project from May through December, 2001. The first phase of the project consisted of a series of six focus groups held in diverse geographic locations — Columbus, OH, Philadelphia, PA, and Atlanta, GA. Four sessions were held with white swing voters, one with political professionals, and one among criminal justice professionals. Following the focus groups, Hart Research conducted a nationwide telephone survey of 1,056 adults from September 6-17, 2001. The sample included a representative national cross section of 804 adults, plus oversamples of 101 African Americans and 151 Hispanics. Theeter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. 20 minority oversamples were weighted to match their incidence in the U.S. population. The survey’s overall margin of error is +3.5%, and is higher for specific subgroups. A large majority of the interviews (863) were conducted before the September 11 terrorist attacks, so the September survey should be understood as essentially a pre-9/11 measure of public opinion. From November 30 through December 2, 2001, Hart Research conducted a shorter follow-up survey among 1,014 adults to assess whether key attitudes toward criminal justice had shifted since September 11. The follow-up survey revealed that there had been little or no movement on questions measuring core criminal justice attitudes, indicating that the findings from the initial survey remain accurate and relevant.]

Most want rehabilitative reform to the current system. ACLU ’01:

New Poll Shows Surprisingly Forgiving Attitude Toward Crime and Punishment: Most Americans Don't Want to Throw Away the Key Share. July 19, 2001. http://www.aclu.org/racial-justice\_drug-law-reform\_immigrants-rights\_womens-rights/new-poll-shows-surprisingly-forgiving

WASHINGTON - A new poll commissioned by the American Civil Liberties Union released today reveals a strong dissatisfaction with the current state of the criminal justice system in America and a growing public confidence in rehabilitation and alternative punishments for non-violent offenders. ¶ "Contrary to popular belief, punishment and retribution are not foremost in most Americans' minds," said Nadine Strossen, President of the ACLU. "In fact, this new study shows our nation to be [is] far more concerned with rehabilitation and social reintegration than with throwing away the proverbial key."

[Interviewing conducted January 5, 2001 through January 22, 2001 N = 2,000 adults 18 and older in the United States Data have been weighted by race. Percents may add to 99% or 101% due to rounding \* indicates less than 1% , -- indicates zero Margin of sampling error is ±2.2 percentage points for the national sample. Margin of error is larger for smaller sub groups.]
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